

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James M. Morton, jr., of Massachusetts, to be circuit judge, first circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Knight to be district judge, western district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William F. Rampendahl to be United States attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward W. Wells to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ON COORDINATION OF MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. METCALF. I ask to have printed as a document the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the coordination of motor transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 6, 1932

CIRCUIT JUDGE

James M. Morton, jr., to be circuit judge, first circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE

John Knight to be district judge, western district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William F. Rampendahl to be United States attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma.

Edward W. Wells to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, blessed Lord God, that our thoughts go along the way of life. We are blest with the mercy of understanding, though sometimes we are unwise. We are not children of darkness, though sometimes we sit in the shadows. We praise Thee that the world to us is a call to service and life. Grant us such a warmth of soul, such a sense of God speaking within that we shall breathe a new consciousness that Thou art our Father. Bless us with the simplicity of childhood that we may know that the highway of a good inspirational life is the way of love and trust. In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and, as I understand, there are no bills on the calendar for consideration to be called up at this time. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that business on the Calendar Wednesday calendar be dispensed with to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we start off now with the objections that are made every session. Nobody knows it better than the distinguished gentleman who now graces the chair. In fact, there was a great deal of discussion whether the rules ought to be changed with regard to that. Naturally, this is the first Wednesday, and I suppose there is no committee ready on the call, but I think it is well that all chairmen of committees and all committees know that hereafter there will be objections made to suspending Calendar Wednesday, so that we will not hear the same old cry and the same old story, which is justified, that at the end of the session the committees have not had their call. Does the gentleman know which would be the first committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I doubt very much whether they have anything, but I am sure the gentleman from Alabama agrees with me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, I agree with what the gentleman has said, that we should, as far as possible, preserve the integrity of Calendar Wednesday, and go forward with the business of the committees, but, as the gentleman recognizes, this is the beginning of the session, and there is no business that is urgent to be reported by any committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' WAGE REDUCTION AND GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several Members I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a short letter which I have written to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in regard to expenditures and revenues of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1932.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

Chairman Committee on Expenditures.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The press announces you are this week calling before your committee colleagues who have introduced bills drastically curtailing the incomes of many thousands of Federal employees, offered on a plea that they are justified by Federal Budget conditions.

The testimony of witnesses necessarily involves their understanding of sacrifices and disastrous effect of proposed reductions on modest incomes, in many cases pledged long in advance by thousands of such employees. One of the eminent witnesses offering the proposal states in his biography he is director and treasurer of three large business concerns and also president of a bank, while another able colleague with a like proposition opened up a prosperous oil field which bears his name and has other large business interests.

Everyone congratulates these witnesses on their good fortune, but with large outside incomes they may have no fair conception of conditions confronted by those depending on a modest stipend with which to meet living conditions and other obligations. The latter army of employees no doubt would gladly pay large income taxes if similarly situated, at rates now less than one-half those levied by other countries seeking to balance their budgets.

The problem presented is contrary to a policy of granting fairly liberal exemptions to small incomes, largely secured through the active aid of the present Speaker of the House with the tacit consent of the Treasury Department. A serious objection is urged against any Pecksniff salary-shaving policy when shown that under the present system of congressional extravagance our national annual appropriations have increased in the past 20 years from about \$726,400,000 in 1911 to \$4,220,000,000 in 1931, in round numbers, or nearly a 500 per cent increase, whereas the population increased only about 15 per cent in that same period. Extravagant Federal subsidies to various favored interests have also been responsible in part for heavy tax burdens borne by the States and

by every taxpayer, all of which can be set forth more specifically, if desired.

The same press notice of income cutting of Government employees carries headlines that the House Naval Committee is to urge a new \$700,000,000 naval building program to include 120 war vessels, some of which are to replace ships that become obsolete in a few years and are then sunk as targets to secure parity with Great Britain. No more danger of war is apprehended from Great Britain than from Canada or Cuba, but it offers a good excuse to the great navy propagandist.

Reference to the same 20-year increase in national expenditures gives \$308,522,579 for War and Navy bills in 1911 and \$843,312,839 in 1931, or upwards of nearly a billion dollars now annually for war apart from the enormous naval program, just presented. All in times of peace following a war to end wars, in which we expended some \$30,000,000,000 or more to attain that end, and yet to-day are threatened with repudiation of international debts reaching \$11,000,000,000 loaned to our Allies. War programs disclose the stupendously extravagant policy now pursued by Congress in the hands of its "war" advisers, following pressure by ship-building companies formerly represented by Mr. Shearer, navy yard, or other interests.

Closely allied to this question is a recent charge by a high naval authority of the House that we are cultivating a great flock of naval butterflies at Newport and elsewhere, and the charge that the Secretary of the Navy sent 30 warships last summer to exploit a business venture on Long Island. To the latter charge the Secretary is reported by the press to have replied it is a custom to extend favors to those in a position to demand them. This is all a proper subject for congressional investigation, but relates to your committee because Congress should halt any increase of naval or military butterflies during present financial conditions. Also any proposed decrease of Federal employees' pay should extend to every officer of the Army or Navy, whether butterflies or hard-working employees, like many thousands of those whose service from 20 to 40 years with the Government is proposed now to be rewarded by drastic salary cuts. I believe several of my colleagues should be heard to this same effect before any report is seriously considered by your committee recommending either of the proposed bills.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FREAR.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. MOREHEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amount authorized to be deducted from appropriations for the fiscal year 1932 for the Indian Service and placed to the credit of the appropriation for contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, for the purchase of stationery supplies, is hereby increased from \$50,000 to \$60,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 15, line 13, I move to strike out the words "for the fiscal year 1932."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 15, line 13, strike out the words "for the fiscal year 1932."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, during this year our people back home, in large numbers, are expecting to come to Washington. School children by the thousands will visit here. Just now in Washington we have one of the best taxicab services ever known in our history. You can get in a taxicab now and ride anywhere in the city proper for 20 cents. The street railways, which for so long robbed the people here with a 10-cent fare, have lost much of their patronage. Because of the influence of the electric-railway system in Washington and their subsidiary bus lines in Washington the Public Utilities Commission, which just now is composed of one man, has been prevailed upon to order that all of these 20-cent taxicabs be taken off the streets of Washington, in that all taxicabs next Saturday must be put back upon a meter basis.

I want to call to your attention what is going to happen. The other evening I had occasion to drive out into the northwest section of the city, close to the Roosevelt Hotel. I ordered a taxicab. I thought it was a 20-cent taxicab. I did not know you could miss one, there are so many of them. By mistake I got into a meter car, and when I got out I handed him a dollar bill and he gave me back 10 cents, and he expected me to give him that 10 cents for a tip. He charged me 90 cents instead of 20 cents. If meter cars now will charge a Member of Congress 90 cents to take him where there are 1,500 twenty-cent taxicabs anxious to take him for 20 cents, what will they do if they are put back on a meter basis?

They are planning to rob the people of this Nation who this year are to come to Washington to attend the George Washington Bicentennial celebration, for which we are now making preparation. General Patrick is the man who has ordered these taxicabs back to the meter system.

I think I speak the sentiments of the Members on the other side of this Capitol as well as of the Members of this House, when I say that we should give General Patrick to understand that Congress is not going to stand for returning to the meter system. Who is complaining? All of the 20-cent taxicabs are anxious to remain in business. They are willing to carry people for 20 cents. They are anxious to carry people for 20 cents. They are protesting the action of General Patrick in ordering them back to the meter system. Why should we go back to that system?

Hundreds of these deserving men who are driving these 20-cent taxicabs are ex-service men with wives and children to support. They could find no other job. They are making a living. Their families have shelter, clothing, food, fuel, and necessities of life. If they are run off the streets, which they will be if this order to go on a meter basis prevails, they will have no jobs and their wives and children will starve. They bravely served their flag and country during the war, and we must see that they get a square deal here in Washington.

There is no one else fostering this proposition other than the street-car companies, which for 15 years we have been trying to get back to their charter price of 5 cents, and which for so long we tried to keep from charging little school children 10 cents—70,000 Washington school children. They and the bus companies and the Black and White and Yellow Taxicab monopoly are the only ones who are pushing this meter proposition.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman will recall that when we did fix the rate for the school children they delayed putting it into effect for one month.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, certainly. If you will go to the depot right now, the Union Station, you will find the greatest monopoly that exists in the United States. There is just one taxicab company that can go into that depot, and when your people come here they must use those meter taxicabs. I hope that before this session adjourns this Congress will protect the rights of the people of this Nation and will stop the infamous taxicab monopoly that exists at our Union Station. [Applause.]

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Should we not do something now and before it goes too far?

Mr. BLANTON. I have already prepared a resolution, and I am going to get Chairman BYRNS to offer it to-day, and if you will pass it unanimously, if Mr. Patrick has any sense at all, he will know that Congress is not going to allow him to put this over on the people, and he will withdraw his meter order.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let us impeach him.

Mr. BLANTON. He ought to understand the sentiment of this House right now, and if he persists in putting his order into effect after we pass this resolution, we can then take drastic action against him to stop it. The people here

are up in arms about it. It is not only unfair to the people of the District of Columbia but it will be unfair to all of the people in every one of the 435 districts of this Nation who will come to Washington during the year.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with every word the gentleman from Texas has said with reference to this matter. I want to ask him whether or not a date has been fixed when this order will go into effect?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It is to go into effect next Saturday, unless the courts stop it by injunction.

Mr. BYRNS. I hope the gentleman will pass his resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I was in conference this morning with corporation counsel, Mr. Bride.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not true that under the order which has been made the taxicabs in the District will be forced to install meters?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. He has entered an order that on next Saturday they all shall install meters, and that means this, that if the meter taxies now charge a Member of Congress 90 cents to go from here to the Roosevelt Hotel when we have hundreds of 20-cent taxicabs available, that when they put the meter system back into force, and we have only meter cars, they will charge \$1.50 to go from here to the Roosevelt Hotel.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will get in his resolution, it will pass this House in two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course it will. And I will get Chairman BYRNS to offer it and pass it to-day. The reason I have taken this time is that I wanted Mr. Patrick to understand that it is the universal sentiment of this House that he must retract that meter order, as we are not going to stand for it. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency reconstruction and fighting fires: For an additional amount for emergency reconstruction and fighting forest fires in national parks, fiscal year 1932, \$55,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available for reimbursement of park appropriations for the amounts transferred therefrom under the authority contained in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this pro forma motion in order that I may get from the chairman of the committee some information concerning two items, one that was passed over on page 13, beginning in line 6, and the other in the section that has just been read, which is of a similar character, except that it refers to an emergency situation in connection with the park service. It seems to me that an item carrying the amount, for instance, of the one on page 13 ought not to go by without at least a word of explanation as to the necessity for it. I wish the chairman would give us some explanation of the emergency that makes this appropriation necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that in every annual bill there is an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to control forest fires if they break out. There have been years when very little of that sum has been used, and then there have been years when a great deal more has been needed. Whenever a fire occurs in any one of these great forests the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to use any other appropriation at his command for the purpose of putting out the fire and saving Government property. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will see that the Chief Forester explained at great length just why this large sum was needed. It is unusual; it is a greater sum than has been

needed for quite a while, and it is because of the fact that there were an unusually large number of fires last summer and last fall, which necessitated the Secretary of Agriculture using other appropriations. This is the amount of money actually expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose, and, of course, it is necessary to reimburse the funds from which he took the money.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then, it has no particular reference to any unusual fire expectation this year?

Mr. BYRNS. No; this money has already been expended.

Mr. KETCHAM. There were an unusual number of forest fires during the part of the year already expired.

Mr. BYRNS. The Chief Forester says it has been the worst season he has ever had, certainly in many years, so far as the number and extent of these fires are concerned.

If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will see the amount of territory that was burned and the value of the timber that was destroyed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of bailiffs, etc: For additional amounts for bailiffs and criers, including the same objects specified under this head in the acts making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the following fiscal years:

For 1931, \$14,000;
For 1932, \$30,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want the attention of the chairman of the committee on this question of bailiffs in the district courts as provided on page 19 of the bill. I understand, of course, this is a deficiency appropriation; but what I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to is this. I do not know the condition in the rural districts, but I do know that in the large cities these bailiffs are miserably paid. They are on a per diem basis. When the judges go on a vacation they are dropped. If the judges do not come down on Saturday, they are not paid for that day. I am sure the gentleman will admit that for five days a week paying the bailiff of a court \$25 a week and then not paying him for the summer months when the judge is away is rather unbecoming the dignity of a Federal court.

I wonder if the gentleman will take this matter up when we have up the regular appropriation bill for the Department of Justice and see if we can not do something for these underpaid employees. It is a terrible situation, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. I am very sure the subcommittee which has charge of that bill will be pleased to do that, especially when they learn of the request made by the gentleman from New York. There has been considerable agitation, I may say to the gentleman, about doing away with the bailiffs. There are some of us who do not know just why they are needed.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. They are attendants of the court.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; and I may have confused criers with bailiffs.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The bailiffs, of course, are officers of the court.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I had one instance, which we need not bring up at this time, in a certain district not very far from the section of the country that the gentleman represents, where the bailiff was the butler in the home of the judge. I am not talking about such instances, but where they do work in the courts as they do in the large cities, if we are going to have them, let us pay them; and if they are not necessary, let us abolish such positions. I hope the gentleman's committee will give some consideration to this question.

Mr. BYRNS. I am quite sure the committee will do that, and I shall call their attention to the gentleman's statement.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS: Page 24, after line 22, insert:

"Fort Worth, Tex., narcotic farm: For acquisition of site under the authority of the act entitled 'An act to establish two United States narcotic farms for the confinement and treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who have been convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes,' approved January 19, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V., secs. 222, 223), \$164,780, to remain available until June 30, 1933."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this estimate came to the House too late to be incorporated in this bill. It reached the House on January 4. It was obtained entirely through the insistence and very earnest activity and attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and I am going to ask him to explain to the House the necessity for its inclusion in the pending bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in January, 1929, an act was passed authorizing the construction of two institutions for the care of persons addicted to habit-forming drugs who had been convicted of offenses against the United States. Provision was made for one of these institutions east of the Mississippi River and one west of the Mississippi. The selection of the sites was left to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General.

The site east of the Mississippi was selected at Lexington, Ky., and appropriation has already been made for that institution. The selection west of the Mississippi was made at Fort Worth, Tex., on land which was offered by the chamber of commerce of that city and which, after inspection of all the sites over the country offered and available, the committee decided to be the most admirably adapted to the purposes of the measure.

Consequently the committee decided and announced that this site would be selected, whereupon the chamber of commerce of the city acquired the land.

As stated by the Director of the Budget, a contract has been entered into, in so far as the good faith of the Government is concerned. The chamber of commerce, acting upon this authorization from the committee and this selection, acquired the land and is holding the same; and this item in the amendment is simply to pay for the land; and the Government, it seems, is honor bound, after this selection, to do this.

This does not provide for immediate construction, the Government wishing to see and study first some of the details of the construction at the narcotic farm at Lexington, Ky., in order that it may profit by the experience in the construction at Fort Worth. This item, therefore, provides for no construction but is simply to pay an obligation which has been incurred there for the Government, upon the Government's selection, at the expense of private individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct my remarks to the next section in this bill, because under the parliamentary situation there may not be much discussion about it.

I want to state to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that my move on the next section, I hope, will not be taken by him as taking an unfair advantage on my part. What little I know of parliamentary procedure I have learned from the gentleman from Tennessee and from other great parliamentarians here.

A great deal has been said about the architectural beauty of the particular school of architecture that the State Department Building partakes of.

I am not going into the æsthetic side to-day. We are in no temper to make an appeal to the spiritual side of the question. I want to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee yesterday very forcefully stated to the House that where the House has heretofore legislated on a

subject there is nothing left for the Committee on Appropriations to do but to carry out the mandate of the House.

We are in exactly the same position in reference to the remodeling of the State Department Building. That has already been accomplished; that is, the legislative side of it has been accomplished. An appropriation of \$3,000,000 was made July 3, 1930, and became a law. On the 10th of July, 1930, the architect signed a contract with the Treasury Department for this work and the preliminaries were completed November 8, 1930, and accepted and signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Senator Smoor, the Supervising Architect, and so forth. After this was done the working drawings and specifications, ready for putting the job on the market, were delivered to the Treasury Department on the 19th of January, 1931, after having been approved by all of the different technical departments in the Supervising Architect's office and approved by the Fine Arts Commission.

The architect is now ready to put this work on the market immediately when, within a little over a month, it is possible to start this work. It has been carefully figured by stone experts and checked by quarrymen who have been consulted, and is found that when this work is started 750 stone cutters scattered in places far from Washington can start work. This is not the case with a great many appropriations which are not prepared to start as quickly as it is possible to do in this case. The 750 men referred to represent approximately 12 per cent of the members of the granite cutters' union of this country, and this work would be done far from Washington in some of the granite States and would extend over a period of approximately eight months. In addition to that, of course, granite cutters would have to be employed on the building cutting off and removing the old stone. Aside from this, in approximately four months from now, besides granite cutters, other trades would be employed on the building.

It is interesting to note that this type of work requires more hand labor relative to the cost than usual building operations.

In connection with the granite cutters' condition in this country, it is one of the worst now existing because of the fact that the proportion of granite now used is so small relative to other stones, and there are approximately 40 per cent of the men in this union now unemployed.

Now, what will that do? I am going to make an appeal to the material side of the subject. It will employ 750 stonecutters for several months. It will employ several hundred masons for several months.

Let me quote from a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed to the architect's office in relation to this project. He says:

Labor is very impatient over the delay which has ensued in launching the Government's construction program. Unemployment is widespread, and the distress resulting therefrom is almost acute. What is needed most of all is the launching of the full and complete construction program of the Federal Government. Even the maximum amount of work which it will do will only serve to take up a partial amount of the slack of unemployment.

And he further says, referring to this particular building:

The most important would be the prompt and immediate beginning of the work of construction and changes.

Now, let me quote a word from the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, with reference to the alteration and renovation of the State Building. Mr. M. J. McDonough, president of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, wrote on June 3, 1931, to Mr. Waddy B. Wood, architect:

It is a great pleasure to recommend the plan you have proposed for adoption, and to express the hope that the Government will agree to the execution of the contract as proposed.

Mr. William J. Spencer, secretary and treasurer of the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor, stated under date of May 28, 1931:

In the opinion of the writer the job proposed is essentially an emergency one; first for the reason that building conditions of the country absolutely demand that where appropriations either of public or private moneys are available for construction, the job to be covered by such an appropriation be started without

unnecessary delay. * * * What the country needs at this time is immediate action on all projects that entail building construction.

Arrangements have already been made concerning night work, so that the work would be carried on exclusively at night, not to disturb public business during the day. Labor has made a generous contribution. Mr. Sam Squibb, international president of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, wrote on September 30, 1930, to Mr. Waddy B. Wood, architect:

Your first question is as to whether you are correct in assuming that if the granite cutters went on after the clerks left in the afternoon there would be no overtime, but there would be seven hours worked in place of the usual eight hours. In other words, the 8-hour day would be what you would pay for instead of the seven hours at night. You are correct in assuming that eight hours' pay would be required for seven hours' work, and all work done over the seven hours would be considered as overtime.

Now, this four months' work will not be done in the District of Columbia. The stone work will be done all over the country. The stone will in all likelihood be quarried in New England. There is plenty of unemployment there.

There is to be no discussion about this paragraph. The provision is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I understood the gentleman to say in a little colloquy the other day that he was not going to oppose this under the circumstances, but to shut his eyes, and then he said jocularly to the gentleman from Nebraska that he would not shut his eyes to the inside. I am rather surprised that the gentleman is going to make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I understand that the House has passed on this, and a limitation by the committee does not apply to this appropriation. It applies to appropriations heretofore made by Congress. Let me repeat what I have already said, at the risk of becoming tiresome, that it will give employment to 750 stone workers for at least four months. Then, too, a few hundred stone masons which surely will be recruited from several near-by States—all helpful in this period of unemployment. Why, if labor were scarce, the argument of economy might prevail. This is the typical kind of public work to stimulate business and alleviate unemployment. I do not know from whose district the stone will come, but some place in the United States. It will not be imported stone. Then there will be the work here. I have an architect's drawing of the remodeled building which I brought here particularly to show to my artistic friend from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want my friend from Missouri to look at this some time during the day and when he sees the whole plan, with the remodeled building reflecting beauty as it does, with the setting of the White House between it and the Treasury, I am sure that he will be glad to remove his gingerbread style of architecture and put in its place something beautiful and artistic. So much for the aesthetic side; but the practical side is so pressing that I shall take the liberty of insisting upon the point of order. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will understand my position in the matter.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The question now under discussion was before the House on June 20, 1930, when the House was considering the question as to whether or not the State, War, and Navy Building should be remodeled, in fact wrecked and rebuilt, at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000. At that time I vigorously opposed this proposal as an indefensible waste of public funds, and an act of vandalism in the destruction of one of the most magnificent, well preserved, and valuable buildings in Washington. At that time the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offered a motion to strike

out the provision authorizing this waste, extravagance, and spoliation. He was seeking to protect the Treasury from an unwarranted invasion and rape, and at the same time preserve one of the noblest types of architecture in the Nation. I was in harmony with his views, and I supported his amendment. My remarks on that occasion appear in the RECORD beginning on page 11369, volume 72, part 10, second session of the Seventy-first Congress, to which I invite the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA], as I believe he will there find not only persuasive but compelling reasons why this and the other buildings mentioned in this paragraph should not be destroyed.

In my former remarks I called attention to the fact that the State, War, and Navy Building represented possibly the most perfect example of the Italian Renaissance order of architecture in the western world; that it was one of the most splendid specimens of one of the eight great types or orders of architecture; that it had its origin in Italy, of which historic land the ancestors of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] were natives; that many of the most beautiful and most famous buildings in Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, Germany, and England are of this type, among which I mentioned the Ricardo Palace at Florence, the Chateau of Blois, the Louvre, the Tuileries, St. Peter's (Rome), the Luxembourg, the Hotel des Invalides, the Pantheon (Paris), St. Mark's Library (Venice), Blenheim Cathedral, and St. Paul's Cathedral (London), and that the two greatest architects of all time, Michelangelo, who built St. Peter's, and Sir Christopher Wren, who built St. Paul's Cathedral, would not have patterned them after the Renaissance order of architecture had it been an ugly and repugnant type, as the gentleman from New York would have us believe. I should hesitate to consider this historic type of architecture ugly, if it satisfied the aesthetic conceptions of Michelangelo and Sir Christopher Wren.

I said then, and I now repeat that while tastes differ, many of the most educated and cultured people in the United States and Europe admire, cherish, and venerate this order of architecture as one of the most perfect types conceived and created by the indomitable genius of man. It is a combination of the classic and Roman types, and after its adoption in the early part of the fifteenth century, it superseded the Gothic order of architecture, which had in turn succeeded the Corinthian, Ionic, and Doric, or Hellenic types, which were brought to their greatest perfection in ancient Greece and adjoining regions.

The gentleman from New York insists the State, War, and Navy Building is ugly. May I say that beauty is essentially a matter of taste and opinion. Rare beauty may exist without our having the faculties to recognize and appreciate it. Individuals, even able art critics, frequently differ as to what constitutes harmony, grandeur, and beauty. Beauty's choicest mirror is an admiring eye, and the beauty seen in a structure, picture, or person is largely in him who sees it, as beauty is not only objective but subjective. Theocritus says that beauty is a delightful prejudice. And Emerson says:

Though we travel the world over to find the beautiful, we must carry it with us or we find it not.

The yardstick by which my friend measures beauty may not be accepted as the inflexible standard by which architectural beauty and harmony are to be measured. Those who are endowed by nature with architectural genius, and who by a lifetime of study of the subject have established enduring fame as masters of architectural technique, may have conceptions of beauty at variance with those of the gentleman from New York. Great architects have not infrequently been in striking disagreement as to what constituted the most perfect type and examples of architecture, just as great painters have had their differences of opinion as to the most outstanding and perfect creations of the brush.

When I discussed this subject in June, 1930, I made an appeal that in the beautification of our National Capital we refrain from destroying any existing building of an outstanding architectural type, and that we do not confine our

building activities to the Hellenic or classic style, or any other particular order, but that in so far as practicable other great orders of architecture be utilized—types of buildings which the architectural genius of all ages of the world's history has created for the embellishment and enjoyment of succeeding ages, so that we may have here in Washington typical examples of all the great styles of architecture. The educational advantages of diversified architectural types in public buildings can not be overappraised.

Sir Christopher Wren, the famous architect, was very small in stature but he bequeathed to oncoming generations temples, cathedrals, and other structures that command the admiration of all people without regard to their culture or knowledge of architectural technique. His epitaph is on St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and is as follows:

If you seek his monument, look around you.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] is a very distinguished, able, and useful Member of this body. I regret that his artistic conceptions and knowledge of architectural technique are not commensurate with his skill and usefulness as a legislator. The gentleman's partiality for the classic, or Hellenic orders, of architecture probably blinds him to the beauty, symmetry, harmony, strength, and grandeur of the Romanesque, Gothic, or other great systems of architecture which appealed mightily to the æsthetic taste of men like Michelangelo, Christopher Wren, and other unchallenged monarchs in the realm of architecture. I am wondering how my friend from New York can harmonize his opinions with those of John Ruskin, probably the greatest master and critic of architecture and painting that the world has ever produced?

And may I say to my friend that in the United States and Europe there are among great architects two schools of thought and opinion, one insisting that all structures should conform to the classic, or Hellenic type, and the other recognizing the beauty, harmony, and grandeur of these and all other orders of architecture, the latter group protesting against the vandalism that would characterize the destruction of buildings like the State, War, and Navy Building, Post Office Department Building, and District of Columbia Building. The first is recognized as the most perfect example of the Italian Renaissance architecture in the western world, and one of the outstanding national monuments of all times; the second as an outstanding example of the Romanesque; and the third is a representation of the Hellenic, or classic type.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The Chairman. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. Lozier. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order to answer a question that the gentleman from New York wishes to propound.

The Chairman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was kind enough to refer to the artistic taste of my ancestors, and then tried to tie this State, War, and Navy Building, as it is now, with the school of architecture of the Italian Renaissance. I hope the gentleman will not be offended if I ask unanimous consent that he may revise his remarks so as not to connect this building with the beautiful description he gave of European architecture.

Mr. Lozier. I have only a cursory knowledge of architecture, although I have long been interested in the subject, and in a somewhat busy life I have found a little time to make a fitful, rambling, or desultory study of this most fascinating subject; and when, about two years ago, the proposal was advanced to remodel the State, War, and Navy Building so as to completely change its exterior appearance and architectural type I supplemented my superficial knowledge of architecture by a somewhat careful but, of course, desultory study in order to satisfy myself as to whether or not, even from an æsthetic standpoint, this splendid monument should be wrecked; and the more I investigated the more I became convinced that the proposal

to wreck and reconstruct the State, War, and Navy Building and destroy other buildings of other types was essentially and undeniably an inexcusable act of vandalism.

I will say to the gentleman from New York that many of the great buildings in Europe and America are either slight or substantial modifications of that type of architecture, of which the State, War, and Navy Building is an outstanding example.

Mr. LaGuardia. Oh, the gentleman is wrong in that respect.

Mr. Lozier. No; I am right in that respect. From an architectural or æsthetic stand point there is absolutely no reason for wrecking these buildings. From the standpoint of good business policy and common sense, I do not see how anyone can justify the wrecking of these colossal structures and the expenditure of many millions of dollars to construct others to replace them. Why should all our public buildings in Washington look alike, and be of the same type, so that when you have seen one, there is nothing different to be found in any of the others? But what is more important still, in this period of economic disaster, why destroy four magnificent public buildings that are as good as they were when first constructed, and which are adequately serving the Government, and spend millions of dollars of public money to build others not as commodious to replace them? [Applause.]

Mr. Arentz. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is rather difficult for one sitting in the House and listening to this debate to reconcile the policy expressed to-day by the majority with that of our plan to help in this crisis of unemployment by finding work for men in diversified activities through Government appropriation, as was referred to by the gentleman from New York. Now, we hear about economy on one hand and unemployment on the other hand. If the United States Government can not lead the way in this fight to curtail further unemployment of the workers of America, we can not expect the industrial leaders, the home owners, and small shop owners and tradesmen of America to lead the way.

In the letter from the American Federation of Labor, which was read by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Green speaks of the number of stonecutters that would be employed on this job. That is just the type of work, in my opinion, that should be provided for by the Government. The policy has been advocated by Senator La Follette to sell \$5,000,000,000 worth of bonds to carry on construction. I have stated from the outset that unless we can have the engineering work done, unless we can plan ahead, there is no use spending money for construction, because it would be wasteful and take too long to get under way, but here we have the plans already made. We have not only the blue prints made but we have the work laid out. All that would be necessary would be to appropriate this money to start to work hundreds of stonecutters and affiliated workmen.

Mr. LaGuardia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Arentz. I yield.

Mr. LaGuardia. The money is appropriated.

Mr. Arentz. I mean appropriated under the terms of this bill.

Mr. Cochran of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Arentz. I yield.

Mr. Cochran of Missouri. Would it not be better if we used the \$3,000,000 in constructing 30 buildings costing \$100,000 each, throughout the United States, rather than to destroy a building that it is not necessary to touch?

Mr. Arentz. If the gentleman will follow out the procedure in the construction of Government buildings throughout the various States of the Union, the gentleman will determine the same thing I have determined. In other words, it requires months and months to pick out the sites. It then requires months and months for the Supervising Architect to decide on plans, and then it requires months and months to ask for bids, and then after that the contractor takes his time before starting work, and a year or two has

elapsed, and I hope to God that by that time this depression will be over and we will not need to do this building.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Did the gentleman read my remarks yesterday where I stated that we have waited for four years to start our building in St. Louis, where the money is in the Treasury?

Mr. ARENTZ. We want something more tangible than that. We want the work started now so that the unemployed can go to work and not only think and speak about it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Why not construct a new building and not destroy a good building? [Applause.]

Mr. ARENTZ. It is not my plan to destroy good buildings. Understand me, I have said nothing about destroying buildings, but I am in favor of getting work under way for which plans are made so that labor may be put to work at once, and unless the Members of this Congress do something to begin this work it will never start.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ARENTZ. I yield gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may not be clear as to what particular building or buildings the gentleman referred. Does the gentleman advocate tearing down such beautiful structures as the State, War and Navy Building just in order to put some stonecutters to work, whether or not there is a real need of such construction?

Mr. ARENTZ. Not at all. I have said nothing about tearing down buildings, but I do advocate carrying on certain changes for which the plans have been drawn and the money appropriated. I refer to the State, War, and Navy Building and the changes in its appearance contemplated. I say that sometime it must be changed, and the money has been appropriated and all arrangements made to start work, that work should be done now. The bankers and industrial leaders of Oklahoma are asking people to do their porch work, to do their kalsomining, to do their plastering, to put cement in their driveways, to make new sidewalks, and a thousand other things, which is the same identical thing as doing the work that is proposed to be done here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But may I suggest that there are thousands of buildings that really should be constructed all over the United States and that this great city of Washington has heretofore received a lion's share of public buildings? There is real need for Federal buildings in every congressional district of the country, and the people would not be so particular about the type of architecture.

Mr. ARENTZ. Let us construct them, then. I am in favor of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. What I am trying to impress on the gentleman is that rather than tear down magnificent and valuable structures like the State, War, and Navy Building, the Post Office, and Commerce Buildings, that the rest of the country should be given consideration on our public-building program.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am fully in favor of your plan for extensive construction now, to-day, when we have unemployment and not wait for next year or the year after.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Why not tear down the Capitol, the White House, and other old buildings and replace them with modern architecture, if the gentleman's argument be good; that is to say, if it is desired only to put men to work?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Why does not the gentleman propose that the Post Office Building at Twelfth and D Streets be torn down? That is in the plans. That is mentioned, together with all these other buildings that are mentioned, including the Southern Railway Building. Why not have those torn down if it is simply to put men to work? I agree with the gentleman if that is the only matter, we should tear down all these buildings and put men to work.

Mr. ARENTZ. When the gentleman is speaking of the State, War, and Navy Building the gentleman is speaking about putting outside surface on the walls of it and changing the whole thing. When the gentleman speaks of de-

molishing the Southern Railway Building and the Post Office Building, the gentleman is speaking about something entirely different. They are not the same and I agree with him, but I do not go so far as to say we should tear down a useful building. The gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. FREAR. Why should we do that except to put these men to work? If it is for the purpose of putting men to work, why not tear down all these buildings?

Mr. ARENTZ. If the gentleman's idea is—

Mr. FREAR. It is not my idea. It is the idea of the gentleman.

Mr. ARENTZ. It is not my idea at all, my friend.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, there has been quite a change in the personnel of this House since \$3,000,000 was voted to remodel the State, War, and Navy Building, and there has been quite a change in the condition of the country since this item was voted. At the time the money was appropriated by the House this country was in a far better condition than it is to-day. There was no deficit and the Congress was running wild making appropriations, with no thought that we would soon be facing a most serious depression. I can also say to the new Members who have come to this Congress that there was by no means a unanimous vote in appropriating the money to destroy this wonderful building. There was a powerful minority and this Hall was the scene of a bitter argument. My colleague Mr. LOZIER made a powerful speech in opposition. I opposed the appropriation then and oppose it now.

I say "destroy" because it means to reconstruct the building to conform to the architecture of the White House and other buildings in that vicinity. In my opinion, Washington is fast reaching the point where our public buildings are something like a circus. If you see one, you see them all.

The Commission of Fine Arts, or whatever you term it, as well as the architects of the country, have sold the idea to Government officials to have uniform buildings. Attractive, no doubt, but all alike. I am not in agreement with this program. Let us have something different now and then.

Now, I do not agree with the manner in which this building program has been proceeding. I showed yesterday in my remarks where we have waited for four years to start a building in St. Louis, where there are a hundred thousand people out of employment. If the Building Commission will devise a type of building suitable for a city of 50,000 population, a type of building for a city having 75,000 population, and a type for a city having a hundred thousand population and build the same type of building in cities of that size, you will expedite the building program. What difference does it make if you construct identical Federal buildings in cities in Maryland, Georgia, Maine, Colorado, and Oregon if the building meets the needs of the Government? Use the same plans and specifications, eliminate the architect in that way, which means a saving of money, and you will have done something worth while. You could have 20 buildings of the same character being constructed in different parts of the country at the same time from the same set of plans. Oh, I know this will not please some, but the big delay is with the architect. Of course, this can not be done when it comes to the large cities, but in the smaller cities a uniform building program could be adopted. If you would follow this plan under our present set up, Congress could appropriate money for a public building in your city of, say, 75,000 to-day. The law providing for the Government to take over a site by paying the approximate value in the Federal court could be invoked and the site be in the possession of the Government within a week. All that is required is to file a declaration of taking and deposit the money with the court. The plans are available and bids could be advertised for. In 30 days thereafter the bids would be received and the contract awarded. Work could commence at once, in fact, while the site was being cleared these details could be arranged. Why, in my city the Globe Democrat, one of our great newspapers, decided to construct a building long after the appropriation was voted for our

Federal building. That great building is not only completed but occupied, and the Federal building has not been started. The present method must be set aside if we are to help the unemployment situation by the construction of public buildings.

We can save \$3,000,000 by adopting this paragraph and preventing the destruction of the State, War, and Navy Building, and we can save \$700,000 by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. Why should we spend \$760,000 to reconstruct the House Office Building? Sixty thousand dollars will be more than enough to connect the rooms. The other facilities suggested are not necessary merely for the convenience of Members. At this time let us use this money to better advantage. This \$3,700,000 will construct thirty-seven \$100,000 Federal buildings in 37 cities in the country. Spread the money around; do not spend it all in Washington, and you will be helping the unemployed.

As I have stated on this floor on numerous occasions, this city has certainly had its share of public work. Three large buildings in the Mall started within the last month. The total cost will be around \$25,000,000. Then your Supreme Court Building across the Capitol Grounds costing \$10,000,000, contract let, and building operations start February 1. Why, one would think this building program is for the city of Washington alone. The depression has not affected this city, that is, to any extent. Here and there some are suffering, but nothing in comparison to the large cities of the country where the money is collected in taxes to construct these buildings.

I congratulate the new chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BYRNS], who is demonstrating that it is possible to prevent the unnecessary expenditure of public funds. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I was very sorry indeed to hear the gentleman from New York say a few moments ago that he proposed to make a point of order against this paragraph. Frankly, I think some portions of it are subject to a point of order, but I had hoped that on account of the exigencies of the situation, the condition of the Treasury, the very earnest expressed desire of the President, and the very earnest wish of the entire Congress that we balance our budget, that this work could be postponed until some more suitable time.

Some of the speeches that are made here from time to time, some of which I have heard this morning, remind me of the old cry:

Oh, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name.

Every time a proposition of this kind comes up gentlemen begin to talk about stonecutters and those who will be benefited if the appropriation is made out of the Public Treasury.

Here is the situation, gentlemen: Regardless of the merits of the proposition from an artistic standpoint—and I confess to you there is no man in this House less qualified to speak on that subject than I am—I do not believe this ought ever to be done. Personally, I think it amounts to an absolute conceit on the part of this generation to feel that it is the last word upon types of architecture. [Applause.] Just as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] said a moment ago, we are going to have a great and beautiful Capital City—in which we all take so much pride—having buildings which will all look alike and when you see one you can take your hat, get on the train or in your motor car, and go home and feel you have seen all of the public buildings of Washington, because they are all being constructed in the same form and in the same manner. I believe that 20 years from now there will be hundreds and thousands of people who will come here—not only citizens of this country but citizens of other countries—who would be glad and who would welcome the opportunity of going down on Pennsylvania Avenue and seeing this great old building. Whatever you may think of it, it represents the type of architecture of the period when it was built, some 40 years ago. I really think it is a great mistake to destroy it. However, outside

of the merits of the proposition, we are in this situation, and I want to appeal to my friend from New York and to my good friend from Nevada: You now propose to take \$3,000,000 of the people's money and use it for the purpose of eliminating space in the State, War, and Navy Building, which is now badly needed.

Take your Radio Commission. I was told a week or two ago that the Radio Commission had made application for space in the new Commerce Building and had been told there was no space which could be given. There is your Radio Commission occupying a great portion of the space on one floor of the National Press Building and doubtless paying thousands of dollars annually for its use.

Now, gentlemen, in the interest of economy, how can we justify ourselves at this time in spending \$3,000,000 in tearing down a part of that old building and eliminating space which is so much needed? I do not think anyone can justify his position in a matter of that sort on the ground that it is going to give somebody a job here in the city of Washington. Why, talk about jobs. There is great need for jobs everywhere, of course, but I want to tell you that here in the city of Washington they are less needed than in any other city or town of the whole United States. [Applause.] We have spent nearly \$50,000,000 in the last few years, and are now spending many millions of dollars in the construction of buildings in this great city. When you talk about the need for jobs, gentlemen, think a little more of the need for jobs back in your own districts and in your own States. [Applause.] Do not get the idea that I am opposed to the city of Washington, that I am not interested in it, or that I am not anxious to see it one of the most beautiful cities in the whole world. Why, a paper yesterday, for which I have great respect and which I read daily, quoted some remarks I made with reference to some property over here back of the Library which had been condemned, for which the Government has to pay \$321,000 more than the \$600,000 which was authorized, and must pay, according to the award of the jury and the court in condemnation proceedings, a sum nearly 128 per cent more than the assessment which has been levied on that property. I said that, assuming that the judgment of the court was correct, the assessment was scandalously low. Of course, I did not mean that in a personal sense. I probably should have used the words "ridiculously low," and it was ridiculously low if the court was correct in its judgment as to its real value. Yet this great paper, for which I have much respect, failed to give the grounds upon which I had made that statement, and I hope that the newspapers of Washington in their reference to the remarks of some of us will in the future explain just why we take the position we take here.

If they did, I feel sure the people of Washington would understand that there is no one in this House, on either side of the aisle, who does not want to see this made a great and beautiful city; but, gentlemen, at the same time, and particularly at this time, we must look to the preservation of the Treasury and the interests of the people back home. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. In view of the very interesting statement that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made, I wonder if the gentleman would not direct his thought right now, while we all have the project in mind, to the amount of the appropriation involved here, \$17,000,000; and particularly will he be kind enough to tell us how this is allocated, how much of it is allocated particularly to the District of Columbia for buildings under construction and how much to the country at large?

Mr. BYRNS. There is no allocation of this particular amount so far as the work to be done here in Washington or the work to be done in the country at large is concerned. It is simply an addition which is being made to the amount now on hand to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the work until July 1.

Mr. KETCHAM. That being true, has the gentleman any information from the testimony that was adduced before the committee to indicate how those responsible for the allocation of this money will distribute it, relatively?

Mr. BYRNS. I have no information as to how they will distribute it, because, of course, it will be used in the general fund; but I think I understand just what the gentleman is alluding to and that is whether or not it is going to slow up public building.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is the idea exactly.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will examine the hearings at page 218, he will find that it was stated by Mr. Martin, one of those who appeared before the committee, that the balance had been reduced as of December 1 to \$55,801,604.19, and I read further from his statement:

We estimate that we will need between \$72,000,000 and \$75,000,000 for the balance of this current fiscal year, which is seven months. Our monthly payment for November was in excess of \$8,000,000 and we expect that the seven months' total will range somewhere between \$72,000,000 and \$75,000,000.

Now, having on hand more than \$55,000,000, the gentleman will very clearly see that \$17,000,000 is ample, under the statement made to the committee, to carry on this work without any possible delay.

In addition to this, I may say to the gentleman that in the meantime the regular annual Treasury bill will have been passed and will doubtless carry an additional sum for public buildings, and this will be immediately available. So there is not the slightest possibility of any let up in the work.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am prompted to ask the question by the statement I saw in the papers, and I do not know, of course, whether it was official or not, that it was not proposed that such an appropriation should come in. Am I correctly or incorrectly advised as to that?

Mr. BYRNS. I am not certain about that, but I think that related not to buildings now under way or buildings where the allocations have heretofore been approved by the Congress. My information is that that alluded to buildings which, it has been indicated by the Treasury, it proposes to erect but which have not yet been sent forward to the House for final approval.

Mr. KETCHAM. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The amount that the gentleman has just referred to in reply to the question submitted by the gentleman is not all being spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no; I said that that was a part of the general program.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which is to be read now, and concerning which there has been an intimation there will be a point of order made against certain parts of it, is the language and the judgment of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], backed up unanimously by the entire committee. I do not think I violate any committee confidence in stating that there was not a voice raised against this paragraph. It was the judgment of our chairman, and he has been with this committee a long time, and, in my judgment, there has never been a better or a more distinguished chairman of this great committee, that some kind of word should go to the powers that be that they must not change or demolish these four buildings.

I wish any one of you who has any doubt about the unwisdom of tearing down these fine buildings would go down and make a personal examination of the four buildings mentioned in this paragraph. Who is it in Congress who wants to tear down the big Southern Railway Building, practically

new, and one of the finest buildings in the city, splendidly built, and for which this Government has paid a tremendous sum? Who wants to tear down that fine building in wanton waste of public money? Who wants to tear down the Post Office Department Building? It is one of the old landmarks here. It may look too old to some people or to some architects, but it is one of the attractions here in the city. Who wants to demolish the old State, War, and Navy Building? It is another landmark of distinction.

As well said by our distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], it would be a travesty on economy for us to destroy these fine, substantial buildings in this time of depression. They are four of the big, fine, picturesque buildings of Washington; and forsooth, to make a few jobs for Washington bricklayers and Washington architects, the proposition is to tear them down, waste them, and rebuild.

How many bricklayers and how many carpenters and how many equipment-furnishing concerns and how many architects from your districts back home will get a single penny out of this great waste and unnecessary expense? Not one. Only Washington parasites benefit. Their distinctive, picturesque beauty has jarred the fastidious eye of some overfed, overpumped, overkilted, overindulged, so-called expert, who has no concern about overburdening the people in 48 States with unbearable taxes.

While serving on the District Committee a few years ago a delegation of silk-stockinged highbrows here demanded of us that we remove the tourist park out of Washington. I asked why. They said it was an eyesore. I replied that it could not be seen except from the air. They said, "Oh, whenever we go off on a visit and return on the train over the Southern Railway bridge that is the first thing we see when we cross the Potomac." I asked where they wanted to move it. They said over beyond the Congressional Country Club. I said, why that is way out in the country, miles from the city where no tourists could find it, as many Congressmen get lost in trying to go there. And I told them that our committee was not going to move it, that we had established one of the finest tourist parks in the world here for the benefit of our home constituents, who did not want to be robbed by Washington hotels.

The only argument for tearing down these four fine buildings is that it will make work for Washington laborers. Why, not longer ago than yesterday I was talking to the manager of one of the big department stores in Washington, and he told me that he could not tell that his business this past year had decreased in any substantial amount. He said he could not feel the depression. That is the situation here in Washington. There is no depression in Washington except what comes from the newspaper columns of the depression that exists in the States outside of the District of Columbia. There is a depression everywhere else, but the fat, regular pay roll of the Government of 70,000 employees who get their pay checks twice a month, in most cases, with new money that has never been in circulation, the depression here is averted. Five hundred million dollars has been expended here and goes to the benefit of the laborers and the architects and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Show me a man who is in favor of tearing down any of these four buildings. There are but three words in the paragraph subject to a point of order. That is "for other appropriations," and, of course, that is subject to a point of order. Why not let that go in. Why does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] want to strike that out? I hope he will reconsider and not make the point of order to those three words.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does not the gentleman think that in the matter of remodeling these buildings we can wait?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course we can, and that is the judgment of the greatest chairman that the Committee on Appropriations has ever had, Mr. BYRNS, of Tennessee. We used to follow him years before he became chairman. During his long and valuable service on the Committee on Appropriations we have followed him on both sides of the

aisle on such questions. There is no partisanship in the Committee on Appropriations. I hope there will be no point of order made against this. This limitation in the bill is the only way the committee had to reach the effort of these people who are trying to demolish the four buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman had to put this in the form of a limitation, for if he had not it would have been knocked out on a point of order. The Committee on Appropriations can not legislate, but it can limit and restrict expenditures of its appropriations, and that is what it is trying to do through these wise limitations put in the bill by our chairman. It is an attempt to say to the powers that be that here in the District of Columbia you shall not spend any part of this \$17,000,000 of the people's money to change or demolish these four buildings that will be useful and stand for a hundred years.

Mr. YON. Would not the gentleman from Texas be sorry to see the Post Office Building demolished?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course I would; it would be an economic blunder and crime if it were done. We have spent millions of dollars to erect these buildings. Now some irresponsible wants to tear them down. We ought to have some buildings of age in the country, some old landmarks to show the Europeans when they come over here. We ought not to let Europe have all the old buildings in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. I agree not only as to the Post Office Building but also as to the Municipal Building.

Mr. BLANTON. And how about the new Southern Railroad Building, owned by the Government, which they had hoped to tear down also?

Mr. HOCH. I have not given attention to that. Those two other buildings are modern, and the offices are well arranged, and they are beautiful buildings.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the State, War, and Navy Building? Why, that is the first building in Washington I take my constituents to see, next to the White House. This Congress must give them to understand, clearly and distinctly, that we are not going to permit them to tear these buildings down or to change them.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] sees fit to exercise his privilege of making a point of order against the words "or other appropriations," we will stop them anyway, for the chairman of our committee will then definitely instruct them by having the House strike out the money needed to demolish them.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] will not raise the point of order to this paragraph or to the three words therein that are subject to the point of order. We could save time by his waiving it. There is more than one way of killing a cat; and if we can not succeed in preventing the tearing down of these buildings by reason of the provision in this paragraph, we can do it very effectively by putting the same limitation in every appropriation bill, or it can be done, and I suggest now that it be done so that the Congress may serve notice on the powers that be that they shall not tear down these buildings, by reducing this appropriation so that they can not do it. [Applause.] There is no use of tearing down any of these buildings, especially at this time. I think it is a crime to even think about tearing down the Municipal Building. It is in conformity with the style of architecture that the Fine Arts Commission thinks this whole town should be built under. I think it is a crime to tear down the Post Office Building, which is as good to-day as it was the day that it was built. [Applause.] Perhaps there is some excuse that may be offered for tearing down the Southern Railroad Building, not because it is not a good building, but

it was not built as a Government building, and it has none of the appearance of a Government building. Some excuse may be offered for tearing it down. There is no excuse in the world for altering the State, War, and Navy Building. When I first came to this town I thought that of all the public buildings I looked upon, and that was 30 years ago, it was the prettiest building in the city of Washington. [Applause.] True, I have but little education along art lines, but I think I know a thing of beauty when I look upon it. That building is a building of beauty. Aside from that, even though they want it to conform to the Treasury Building on the one side and the White House in the center, as suggested by the chairman of this committee, we are looking out for space all of the time, and yet we are destroying space and doing a needless and useless thing. We might as well say that in order to give employment to labor we should hire men to haul brick from one side of a yard to the other and then haul them back again and pile them up. There should be some useful purpose in labor and construction. I hope the gentleman from New York will not raise the point of order; but if he does it, I hope the chairman of this committee will offer an amendment to reduce this appropriation so that notice will be served on the gentlemen who have been trying to tear down and alter the State, War, and Navy Building and these other buildings so that they may be made to know that they are to halt in their efforts at destruction. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sites and construction, public buildings, act of May 25, 1926, as amended: For an additional amount for public buildings, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1932, \$17,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the construction of public buildings shall be used for remodeling and reconstructing the Department of State Building under the authorization therefor contained in the act approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 907): *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the demolition of the District of Columbia Municipal Building at Fourteenth and E Streets NW., the Post Office Department Building at Twelfth and D Streets NW., or the building, 1300 E Street NW. (formerly the Southern Railway Building).

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the entire paragraph, and I make the point of order on the words "or any other" in line 2, page 25.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bankhead). What is the ground of the point of order?

Mr. LaGuardia. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it refers not to the appropriation in this bill but to an appropriation heretofore made and not referred to or connected with any item in this section or in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard?

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LaGuardia. I make the point of order upon the three words in line 2, page 25, and withdraw it on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations tacitly confesses the validity of the point of order. A number of precedents on this proposition might be cited, but the Chair does not think it necessary to do so. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LaGuardia. I withdraw the point of order as to the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Byrns: Page 25, line 1, strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,800,000."

Mr. Byrns. Mr. Chairman, my object in offering this amendment is in line with the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood]. It has been stated by those representing the Treasury Department that it is expected that \$200,000 will be expended between now and July 1 in connection with the work of remodeling the State, War, and

Navy Building, and that the remainder of the \$3,000,000 would be used in the next fiscal year. I have offered this amendment reducing the sum carried in this appropriation bill by \$200,000, the amount it is said is to be expended, for two reasons: In the first place, if the House adopts the amendment, it will be very clear notice to the authorities that the House does not want this work done at this particular time. In addition to that, I feel sure, after conferring with some of the members of the subcommittee, that the committee will incorporate in the annual Treasury appropriation bill a provision similar to this, of course eliminating the language which has been stricken out under the point of order. I think that serves exactly the same purpose that the committee was trying to serve when it put this provision in.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The adoption of this amendment will not only be notice but under legislative interpretation will be a direction and mandate to them that the Congress of the United States forbids them to do this work.

Mr. BYRNS. It can and should be so construed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Could the gentleman tell the House how much in these other appropriations would be affected by these three words? Had they already started to use some of this money?

Mr. BYRNS. No. I do not know whether they have prepared any plans or not, but they certainly have not done anything further than that.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman does not think that is really vital?

Mr. BYRNS. They may have some balances on hand, of course, that they could use. That is what we were trying to eliminate by the use of this language which has been stricken out under a point of order.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman has accomplished the same result.

Mr. BYRNS. I think so.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. Are there any outstanding contracts for materials or anything like that?

Mr. BYRNS. No; there are none so far.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. It seems to me this amendment and the limitations imposed in the bill are necessary in order to curb the bureaucratic despotism that has grown up in our departments of Government, that contemptuously ignores the will of Congress whenever congressional action runs counter to their selfish and sordid wishes. These departmental buccaneers, with the sanction, I am sorry to say, of a previous Congress, seem determined to demolish a large number of public buildings in Washington that cost the American people approximately \$10,000,000 and spend that amount of public funds to build new ones which these self-constituted judges of art consider more ornate and artistic, although the buildings condemned to destruction are among the largest and best preserved structures in Washington and are adequately serving the Government, and are affording more office space than will be available in the proposed new buildings, and which will involve an ultimate expenditure of approximately \$20,000,000.

It is not only vandalism to destroy these magnificent building but inexcusable waste to spend millions of dollars for their replacement at a time when indescribable economic distress exists in every nook and corner of the Nation. I congratulate the chairman [Mr. BYRNS] on his wise judgment in proposing these limitations, and this amendment, which are designed to protect the public Treasury from an indefensible waste of public funds. This amendment will accomplish the desired result and serve notice on these departmental heads that they must not begin the demolition

of these buildings. This is a wholesome provision, and I trust it may be adopted unanimously. Why waste \$10,000,000 in tearing down the present perfectly good buildings and erecting others in their place which will not serve the public needs any better than those which they propose to destroy?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 103, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, \$75.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 36, line 3, after the period, insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to employ such additional draftsmen, clerks, and inspectors as in his discretion may be necessary to carry on the program of alterations of naval vessels and increases of the Navy efficiently, and to pay said employees out of the funds already appropriated for modernization and increases of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order that the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, which is not authorized.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I know this amendment is subject to a point of order. I have five minutes to discuss this question, and there are 1,100 men whose positions depend on the amendment.

This is an amendment that will not cost the Government one extra penny. It does not cost a cent, but it will actually save money. Every day we hear condemnation of the Treasury Department and other departments on account of red tape and not getting work done. That is exactly the situation here. If we undertook to build the Capitol Building and put on half the number of draftsmen needed, you can see the inefficiency and lack of economy in it. That is just exactly what is happening in the modernization of these ships. There are not enough draftsmen to do the work, and the number of draftsmen has been limited by the appropriation. Thirty million dollars of this work came on and the draftsmen were limited to the old schedule, and they are not able to go ahead.

There is contemplated a lay-off in New York of about 600 men; in Philadelphia a lay-off, and in Norfolk a lay-off. I am told by the navy yards that if this work can flow smoothly, if the draftsmen can keep up with the work, they will save between a hundred thousand and two hundred thousand dollars in this modernization.

It is your responsibility as much as it is mine. If you mean what you say, if you want to put men to work, here is a chance to do it. If you want to cut out red tape and inefficiency, here is a chance to do it, and it will not cost a cent of money. I ask each of you not to interpose any objection to this. The chairman of the committee was begging that objections not be interposed to something that the gentleman was interested in. This is only common sense; it is practical, and it will be extremely beneficial. It will keep a thousand men at work who would otherwise be thrown out of employment. It does not cost the Government one additional penny.

Under the appropriation in the Bureaus of Engineering and Construction and Repair, the appropriations are limited to a certain amount. That has all been allocated. This big load of modernization has come on and the present draftsmen are not able to keep that work flowing so that they can bring men in as needed. There are hundreds of men ready to go to work, but the draftsmen can not keep up with them.

In my yard men are working overtime. They do not mind it; but think in this day and time, with people out

of work, of working men overtime in order to keep up with the work, so try to help this work out, and bring other men back. That is the situation. If any Member wishes to go on record as knocking a thousand men out of work by objection to this, that is his privilege; but here is something that will not cost any more.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Texas, because I expect this gentleman to be with me on this. It does not cost any more money.

Mr. BLANTON. I am for the man who is out of work; but the gentleman admits that unless his amendment is passed a thousand men will go off the pay roll?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. They will go off the pay roll in January and February.

Mr. BLANTON. How many?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Between one thousand and eleven hundred.

Mr. BLANTON. Then we would save the salaries of about 1,000 or 1,100 men if they go off the pay roll?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. They will not be able to spend the funds already appropriated up to the 1st of July under this modernization unless these men are brought back.

Mr. BLANTON. But when they go off their salaries stop, and it will save that much to the Government.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. But the money is going to be spent eventually, so why not spend it this winter, when it is needed, rather than next summer.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. YON. Does not the gentleman think that the policy that has been carried out in connection with all the public buildings has been the means of making money available without increasing the deficit in the Treasury?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Probably so. Gentlemen, there is one other thought. This very provision is to be recommended in the next naval bill, effective in July, and I have a letter here from Admiral Rock in which he says that because of the situation in which they now find themselves they are going to attempt to correct it in the next naval bill, so as to give them an opportunity to employ these draftsmen. Now, if it is going to be done in July, why not let it become effective right now and help out employment during the present winter?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The admiral may have another guess coming to him. That is what he is going to propose, but it is a question as to what Congress is going to do.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Would the gentleman from Texas build a house without supplying sufficient architects to prepare the plans and specifications and supervise the work?

Mr. BLANTON. But if I did not need the house I would not build it at all.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. This does not do anything but give the Secretary of the Navy discretion to do this thing. He will not call in these draftsmen unless they are needed; but if they are needed, it gives him the discretion to put them on this work, and in order to carry on the work these draftsmen should be kept on, and it is nothing but ordinary common sense. This is what any good business man would do in meeting a situation of this kind. I have heard the gentleman from Texas criticize the departments because of red tape, so that I thought he would be the first one to help me in this fight. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the gentleman knows that, personally, I would like very much to yield to any request he might make of me, but I feel that under the circumstances this amendment ought not to be considered. We have had no hearings on it; we have had no requests from the President, and there has been no request, so far as I know, from the Secretary of the Navy. So it seems to me that under

those circumstances it would be unwise to put it in this bill. Therefore I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I have had this up with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and with Admiral Rock, and I have their letter saying that this will be recommended in the next bill, to be effective in July. They both told me last week that this was needed in order to keep these forces at work.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say this to the gentleman, in response to his statement about the letter: Of course, it may be the opinion of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy that this ought to be done, but when the estimates come forward the subcommittee will consider them, conduct hearings on them, report to the House, and the House will then have an opportunity to have some information about the situation.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does the gentleman understand that I am not asking for an additional penny, but just to allow these men to be paid out of the modernization funds already appropriated?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand that; but when you use funds already appropriated you are using funds in the Treasury, and thus increasing the deficit. I really do not think we should legislate in that way on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, I am constrained regretfully to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MOREHEAD). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOREHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MONTAGUE and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] desire to submit a motion to recommit the bill. The practice of the House heretofore has been to give to the minority the right to make the motion to recommit when a member of the minority qualifies for that purpose. So the Chair will ask the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia if each of them is opposed to the bill?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am opposed to the bill as it is, and expect to vote against it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee and as one who is opposed to the bill in its present form, I should like to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I object to that form of qualification.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that a member of the

committee who qualifies as being opposed to the bill undoubtedly would have preference in recognition.

Mr. BYRNS. I simply wanted to know if the gentleman is opposed to the bill as it stands.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; I am, and shall vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] qualifies and is entitled to submit a motion to recommit.

The gentleman from Alabama offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6660 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same forthwith back to the House with an amendment striking out the figures "\$760,000" in line 20, page 3, and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$60,000," or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. BLAND) there were—ayes 61, noes 59.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 132, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]
YEAS—233

- Allgood Johnson, Mo. Parks
Almon Doxey Johnson, Okla. Parsons
Andresen Drane Johnson, S. Dak. Patman
Andrew, Mass. Driver Johnson, Tex. Patterson
Andrews, N. Y. Evans, Mont. Johnson, Wash. Pettengill
Arnold Fiesinger Jones Polk
Bacon Finley Karch Pratt, Harcourt J.
Baldrige Fish Ketcham Pratt, Ruth
Bankhead Fishburne Kinzer Purnell
Barton Foss Kniffin Ragon
Beck Frear Knutson Ramseyer
Beedy French Kopp Rankin
Beers Fulbright Kurtz Rayburn
Bland Fuller Lambertson Reilly
Blanton Fulmer Lambeth Rich
Bowman Garber Lamneck Robinson
Brand, Ga. Gasque Lanham Rogers
Briggs Gibson Lankford, Ga. Romjue
Brumm Gilbert Lankford, Va. Rutherford
Buchanan Gilchrist Larrabee Sanders, Tex.
Burch Gillen Leavitt Sandlin
Burtness Glover Lichtenwalner Schafer
Busby Goodwin Loofbourow Schneider
Cable Goss Lovette Selvig
Canfield Green Lozler Shallenberger
Cannon Greenwood Luce Shannon
Carden Gregory Ludlow Shott
Carter, Wyo. Griswold McClintic, Okla. Shreve
Cartwright Guyer McGugin Simmons
Cary Hadley McKeown Smith, Idaho
Chindblom Haines McMillan Smith, Va.
Chipperfield Hall, Ill. McSwain Smith, W. Va.
Christopherson Hall, Miss. Magrady Snell
Clague Hall, N. Dak. Major Snow
Clancy Hancock, N. C. Mapes Sparks
Clark, N. C. Hare Martin, Mass. Stafford
Clarke, N. Y. Harlan May Steagall
Cochran, Mo. Hart Michener Stevenson
Cochran, Pa. Haugen Millard Stokes
Cole, Iowa Hill, Ala. Miller Strong, Kans.
Colljer Hill, Wash. Milligan Summers, Wash.
Colton Hoch Mitchell Sumners, Tex.
Connolly Hogg, Ind. Montague Swank
Cox Holaday Moore, Ky. Swick
Cross Hollister Moore, Ohio Taber
Crowe Hooper Morehead Tarver
Crowther Hope Mouser Treadway
Darrow Hopkins Murphy Tucker
Davis Herr Nelson, Mo. Turpin
DeRouen Howard Niedringhaus Underhill
Dickinson Huddleston Nolan Underwood
Dies Hull, Morton D. Norton, Nebr. Weeks
Dieterich Hull, William E. Oliver, Ala. West
Disney Jeffers Owen White
Dominick Jenkins Parker, Ga. Whittington

- Wigglesworth Willson Woodruff Wyant
Williams, Mo. Wingo Woodrum Yon
Williams, Tex. Wolfenden Wright
Williamson Wood, Ga.

NAYS—132

- Adkins Coyle Hess Person
Allen Crall Holmes Pou
Amle Crosser Hornor Prall
Arentz Cullen Kahn Rainey
Auf der Heide Curry Keller Ramspeck
Bachmann Dallinger Kelly, Ill. Ransley
Barbour Davenport Kelly, Pa. Reed, N. Y.
Beam Delaney Kennedy Reid, Ill.
Black De Priest Kerr Rudd
Bloom Doughton Kleberg Sabath
Boehne Douglas, Ariz. Kvale Schuetz
Boileau Douglass, Mass. LaGuardia Seger
Boland Drewry Leech Sinclair
Bolton Eaton, Colo. Lehibach Sirovich
Boylan Eaton, N. J. Lewis Spence
Britten Englebright Lindsay Stalker
Browning Eslick Linthicum Stewart
Brunner Estep Lonergan Sullivan, N. Y.
Bulwinkle Evans, Calif. McClintock, Ohio Sutphin
Butler Fitzpatrick McCormack Taylor, Colo.
Byrns Gambrell McFadden Temple
Campbell, Pa. Garrett McLaughlin Thatcher
Carley Gavagan McReynolds Tierney
Carter, Calif. Gifford Maas Timberlake
Chapman Golder Mansfield Vestal
Chavez Goldsborough Martin, Oreg. Warren
Christgau Granfield Norton, N. J. Wason
Cole, Md. Griffin O'Connor Weaver
Collins Hancock, N. Y. Oliver, N. Y. Welch, Calif.
Condon Hardy Palmisano Wolcott
Connerly Hartley Parker, N. Y. Wolverton
Cooke Hastings Peavey Wood, Ind.
Cooper, Tenn. Hawley Perkins Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bacharach

NOT VOTING—67

- Abernethy Doutrich Larsen Strong, Pa.
Aldrich Dyer Lea Sullivan, Pa.
Ayres Erk McDuffie Swanson
Bohn Fernandez McLeod Sweeney
Brand, Ohio Flannagan Maloney Swing
Buckbee Free Manlove Taylor, Tenn.
Burdick Freeman Mead Thomason
Campbell, Iowa Granata Montet Thurston
Cavicchia Hogg, W. Va. Nelson, Me. Tilson
Celler Houston, Del. Nelson, Wis. Tinkham
Chase Igoe Overton Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Ohio Jacobsen Partridge Vinson, Ky.
Corning James Pittenger Watson
Crisp Johnson, Ill. Quin Welsh, Pa.
Crump Kading Sanders, N. Y. Whitley
Culkin Kemp Seiberling Withrow
Dickstein Kendall Somers, N. Y.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

- Mr. McDuffie (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. Celler (against).
Mr. James (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
Mr. Manlove (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
Mr. Thurston (for) with Mr. Mead (against).

Until further notice:

- Mr. Crisp with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Kemp with Mr. Free.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Flanagan with Mr. Campbell of Iowa.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Ayres with Mr. Hogg of West Virginia.
Mr. Quin with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Crump with Mr. Kendall.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Whitley.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Swing.
Mr. Overton with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Swanson.
Mr. Vinson of Kentucky with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Larsen with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Jacobson with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Culkin with Mr. Erk.
Mr. Granata with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Bohn with Mr. Tilson.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP, has voted.

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. BACHARACH. I have a general pair with the gentleman from Georgia, and I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I report back the bill amended in accordance with the instructions in the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion by Mr. BYRNS to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TAXICABS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 90

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, that Commissioner Patrick, of the Public Utilities Commission, should rescind immediately his order requiring taxicabs in the District of Columbia to be placed upon a meter basis, it being the intention that visitors coming to the Nation's Capital during 1932 shall have taxicab service at the very lowest rate possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

THE MORATORIUM

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered over the radio on Sunday afternoon by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. LOUIS T. McFADDEN, in debate with Norman Thomas on the subject of the moratorium, over station WOR Sunday afternoon, December 27, 1931, between 3 and 3.45 o'clock:

As a text for this discussion, I desire to quote from an eminent authority, Calvin Coolidge, who, on October 22, 1930, said:

"Those who are constantly agitating, either for political or publicity purposes, for a revision of German reparations, and who are trying to connect them with the European debts owed the United States, are doing distinct injury to the world economic situation. They arouse new uncertainties and inflame old animosities. We should regard these questions as settled. Let Europe adjust its own difficulties. The present rates of payment can be met by all countries concerned.

"Those saying that if Germany defaults reparations other countries can not pay the United States debts are overreaching themselves. That means that if reparations are not collected from Germany they must be collected from the taxpayers of the United States."

The principles of a republic are those of liberalism, and it fosters the spirit of equal justice among its citizens and of fair dealing with foreign states. Throughout our own history public opinion has manifested its sympathy with the growth of liberal institutions abroad and with foreign causes which appeal primarily to the principle of justice.

In formulating national policy, therefore, when a new question rises in our relation to foreign states public opinion here is not inclined to override the promptings of calm and fair judgment and act hastily in an arbitrary spirit of self-interest. The public judgment at times may be at fault because of insufficient information, but the fault is more likely to arise from this cause than from a deliberate intention to ignore standards of right conduct.

The war in Europe left us a legacy of complicated international questions, and because of their complications there has been much diversity of opinion as to their proper solution. Public opinion has given much attention to them and has been patient and conscientious in its desire to formulate a judgment.

We have heard all that our former allies have had to say about the war debts which they owe us and about the German war reparations. We have been urged as a duty to join the League of Nations and the World Court. Voices from Europe and voices here have urged us as a duty to cancel the allied debts and to forsake the principle of political isolation which they tell us is an ignoble and selfish one.

For some years after the war the situation was so confused that it was impossible for public opinion to reach a judgment. But 13 years have passed now since the war ended, and things

have transpired both here and in Europe that tend to simplify the problem.

We know that when the allied war debts were funded we canceled more than half of the amount of those debts. We know that we took no share in the reparations exacted from Germany, and that there is no logical reason why we should have any concern with them to-day. We know, too, that the German reparations have been a cause of frightful disorganization in Europe ever since the war and that the Allied Governments have persistently sought to make the payment of their debts to us dependent upon the receipt by them of reparations from Germany. We are conscious of a strong determination in Europe to involve us intimately in the interminable controversies which convulse that continent. Just as long as Europe can keep us in these international conferences on war debts, reparations, and all world affairs, just that long has she hopes of involving us in the League of Nations, the World Court, and the world bank—all instruments concocted to take away our freedom in Government and finance.

We know that in the normal prosecution of our domestic and foreign commerce we prospered after the war and that in 1924 the country was in a sound condition financially and industrially. There was nothing in our domestic condition that menaced or threatened this prosperity. But in little more than five years thereafter our financial and industrial structure was shaken to its foundations, chiefly because of the dislocations caused by the enormous loans made to Europe on a scale far beyond Europe's capacity to repay.

We are told that we must postpone or cancel payments on our foreign debt to restore our export trade. In other words, if we give our foreign customers money with which to purchase merchandise, they may buy it from us.

In the 10 years ending with 1929 our total of exports to all countries was \$49,609,677,114. In the same period our total of money sent abroad was over \$60,000,000,000, including foreign loans, investments, debt-funding settlements, gifts, ocean freight bills, travel expenses, and foreign remittances. Exports for the war period were more than covered by our direct war expenditures, which last was also a contribution to foreign interests.

We, ourselves, paid for every dollar of merchandise sold abroad by exporting money which we are now told is never coming back to us. This economic absurdity finally collapsed under its own weight; our alleged "prosperity" ruined us. We can not afford to restore a foreign trade in which we pay for our exports as well as for our imports.

"Hands across the sea" are always palm up when westbound.

We realize now that, far from having followed a policy of isolation, we have to a great extent made Europe's problems our own and in doing so have sacrificed our own interests and imposed unjustified burdens upon our own people. To do more than we have already done would endanger our present safety and jeopardize the Nation's future.

The only good thing about the joint resolution authorizing the Hoover debt moratorium was the amendment which expressed the will of the Congress that there shall be no reduction or cancellation by the United States Government of the debts owed the United States by the foreign countries.

Apart entirely from the international debt question, the method by which the matter was put before the Congress for action sets a dangerous precedent in the negotiation of agreements with foreign governments. If, when Congress is not in session, a President can call in congressional leaders, or even communicate with a majority of the Members of both Houses, telling them that a certain proposed agreement with foreign governments is desirable and urgent, and upon these representations can obtain their promises to ratify it when it is later presented to the Congress in session, the independent power of the Congress under the Constitution is virtually destroyed. I will here and now venture the definite opinion based upon the discussion and expressions of the Members of both Houses of Congress during the consideration last week of the Hoover moratorium that if they had not been pledged last June they would have voted against ratification of the Hoover moratorium.

In the first place, the President is enabled to assure the foreign governments that the Congress will ratify what he does, and this places the Congressmen in an embarrassing position if they subsequently see reasons why ratification should be withheld. The finished product may bear a different aspect from that which it first presented; but, conveying themselves bound by their promises, the legislators may find themselves unable to reconsider their position and, against their better judgment, will vote for ratification.

This is as true with reference to treaties which come only before the United States Senate for ratification, as for agreements affecting revenue, like this one, which must come before both Houses of the Congress.

In this case the information contained in the Executive message asking for ratification was entirely inadequate and misleading. It asked for the ratification of an agreement proposed on June 20 last, for which a certain number of Senators and Representatives had promised approval.

But the agreement of June 20 had, in fact, been materially changed by a subsequent agreement made with France on July 6. Several nations which had immediately ratified the agreement of June 20 had to reconsider their action, and on August 11 they met in London and signed a protocol binding themselves to the terms of the American agreement with France and making Germany a party to it also.

Yet the Executive message on the 10th of December asked for ratification of the moratorium proposed on June 20 and said not a word about the subsequent changes.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee to the House stated that the Franco-American agreement and the London protocol had been before the committee when considering its report. How these documents came before the committee I do not know; they did not accompany the message of the President, and they were never at any time presented to the House itself for its consideration. They together contained the real moratorium agreement, and they ought to have been submitted formally to the Congress.

The whole thing was done in a loose and inadequate manner which showed small regard for the dignity of the Congress and which was a blow to the treaty-making processes of the Constitution.

The general impression, both in and out of Congress, appears to be that Congress has ratified an agreement for the temporary suspension of payments of all war debts and reparations as proposed on June 20 last, the subsequent changes being of only minor importance. This impression is erroneous.

The Franco-American agreement of July 6 excepts the unconditional annuities from the operation of the moratorium; it leaves them in full force, and it rivets them more firmly upon Germany by reason of the agreement of the United States with France that they must be paid. Moreover, when a little later Germany was made a party to this agreement by the London protocol, instead of lessening the amount of the reparations which Germany must pay unconditionally, it increased that amount, because it provided that the conditional annuities suspended for one year are to be funded over a 10-year period and that these payments must then be met unconditionally.

Under the Franco-American agreement the amount that Germany must pay annually without the right of postponement is a larger sum than if the Franco-American agreement had not been made. The moratorium has not lightened the absolute burdens of Germany; it has made them heavier.

If there was any merit at all in the original proposal of June 20, that all payments between governments be temporarily suspended, it would have consisted in holding the critical situation in suspense long enough to give the European governments time to agree upon mutual concessions. But the original proposal was entirely discarded, and under French insistence the absolute obligations of Germany were made harder and more rigid. It can not be said, therefore, that the final agreement has improved conditions in Europe.

It is claimed that the proposal of June 20 prevented a financial collapse in Germany which would have been catastrophic in its influences elsewhere. This was what it was intended to do, but did not accomplish. To accomplish this, immediate ratification by France, as well as by the other nations, would have been necessary.

But it will be recalled France refused to ratify it, and insisted upon the new agreement which I have just described. Instead of the financial conditions in Germany improving they immediately became more critical, and the bankruptcy, which was only threatened on June 20, became actual when later in the summer the great Danat Bank and the banks generally in Germany were thrown into bankruptcy and the Reichsbank had to close its doors. This brought on the financial collapse in England and the fall of the pound, which carried down with it the currencies of numerous of the smaller European countries. If financial catastrophe in Europe has not supervened as a result of the Franco-American agreement, it is hard to understand what financial catastrophe is.

The trouble with Europe to-day is that its international financial structure is grotesquely inflated with a fraudulent asset of \$10,000,000,000 in German reparations with which the allied governments seek to pay all their debts. This asset has no value because it is an asset only if Germany pays punctually the annual interest and sinking fund upon it. Germany has not paid these annual sums out of her own resources. After the war she paid \$9,000,000,000 in reparations which was in fact all that she justly owed. Since then she has not paid reparations out of her own resources, she can not so pay them, and she does not intend to try to do so.

The entire inflated financial structure since the war has been predicated upon the theory that Germany could pay the charges upon billions in reparation bonds held by the allied governments; and there has been an iridescent hope that the American public might be induced to buy these bonds from them. The allied treasuries would thus be filled, and the job of patrolling Germany would be transferred to the United States Government.

It is upon this grandiose financial coup that the allied governments and the international bankers have for years unsuccessfully lavished the intellectual treasures of their minds, and it is because they have made this plan their chief preoccupation that genuine reconstruction in Europe has been at a standstill for 13 years. It is time that this conception be abandoned.

To come back now, in closing, to the amendment which accompanied the passage of the joint resolution by the Congress the other day.

The amendment makes it plain that it is the will of Congress that there shall be no cancellation or reduction of the allied debts to the United States. We believe that these are just debts and that the allied governments are able to pay them out of their own resources and without reference to receipts from German reparations.

Heretofore the allied governments have contrived to get the money from Germany, and there is plenty of indication that they are unwilling to pay us any sums that they do not first collect in this way. One thing is sure, namely, that Germany is going to stop paying reparations, because the American bankers are going to be made to stop lending billions to Germany with which to pay them.

The allied governments will therefore have to make their payments to the United States out of their own resources. The decision whether they will do so is for them alone to make. We can be of no assistance to them in making up their minds. But we will not accept German reparation bonds from them in lieu of what they owe us, nor will we permit them to negotiate them upon the American investment market. In the future, as in the past, it will remain the American position that there is no connection between German reparations and allied debts to the United States.

Mr. Thomas, in answering your presentation I desire to make a constructive suggestion, one that will go further than any other in laying the basis for a justification of real disarmament in the United States, and this suggestion should receive the careful thought and attention of those people in the United States who are so active in agitation looking toward disarmament.

I have pointed out that international bankers and diplomats contend that Europe can not pay the debts it owes to the United States. Our former allies insist that they will pay us only if Germany pays them, and they add that Germany can not pay. According to this contention, American taxpayers are expected to pay Germany's so-called "reparations" to the European nations, which, with our aid, defeated her in the World War.

The allied nations have received substantial material benefit from the war. They have annexed large areas of colonial and other territory which belonged to Germany, Austria, and Turkey. They have persuaded us to cancel the debts incurred for money and material advanced them during the war. The present debts owed us are for money loaned Europe for reconstruction purposes and property sold them at 20 cents on the dollar.

They now claim that world-wide deflation makes the whole or partial cancellation of the postwar debts, amounting to eleven and one-half billion dollars, necessary. The United States is asked to assume the entire burden of this deflation, Europe assuming none. The question of "ability to pay" has been brought to bear on every nation and people involved except the United States and the American taxpayer.

It is only fair that Europe should share in this deflation. It is perfectly practicable for England and France to do this without financial expenditure of any kind; since they are our principal debtors it is fortunate that they are the best equipped to share the burden with us.

England is possessed of numerous island and mainland colonies close to our coasts. No reference to Canada is here intended. Canada is a self-contained Dominion, virtually an independent nation and a most excellent neighbor. Canada is the most virile part of the British Empire to-day and brightest hope for the growth and continuance of British power and influence in the world.

There are other British possessions which do not enjoy the status of Canada. Many of them are the seats of strongly fortified British naval bases and by their location can be designed for no other purpose than possible hostilities against the United States. Bermuda is a case in point. That group of islands has large dockyards and extensive fortifications, barely 30 hours by fast steamer from New York City and hardly 4 hours by airplane. It is only 5 hours by airplane from Hamilton in Bermuda to the Capitol of our Nation at Washington.

The Bahama Islands are not fortified but provide a splendid base for aerial operations against Florida and our south Atlantic seacoast. Jamaica dominates the Caribbean from the center and is an effectual naval and aerial "cover" for the Panama Canal. The Windward and Leeward Islands wall in the Caribbean on the east, British Guiana providing a mainland "anchor" for the long chain of islands which run north to Porto Rico and Haiti. On the western side of the Caribbean, British Honduras occupies a position of great strategic importance.

Trinidad, almost touching the South American Continent, has a strong naval base; so has Kingston, in Jamaica. I would point out that no possible enemy threatens British interest in our home waters, unless Britain regards the United States as an enemy.

May I suggest that it would be a welcome gesture of intended friendship if England should offer to transfer to the United States in part payment of her debt to us the colonial possessions which she holds in waters which wash our coasts from Florida to Maine. It would provide a partial settlement of the debt burden which England finds so heavy, and it would give us a feeling of security, besides strengthening the friendship between the two nations. It would be the most effectual step in the direction of real disarmament which could be taken in the present state of the world. I commend this suggestion to all those groups in the United States who are so active at this time in disarmament—in both our Army and Navy.

I desire to point out that a large part of our national territory in the past has been acquired by purchase. The Louisiana Purchase, the Indian treaties, the treaty of Guadalupe Hidaigo, the Gadsden Purchase, the acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and the comparatively recent purchase of the Danish West Indies, now the Virgin Islands, are cases in point.

It is very likely that the American people would be content to accept a partial settlement of the European debts in territory. Ceding the territory in question would be a convincing evidence that England is willing to bear part of the burden which it now seems she is trying to place upon our unaided shoulders. If this understanding of her intentions is unfair, this proposed territorial suggestion would be a splendid way to prove it.

The territory is extensive. It comprises some 400 islands and the mainland colonies of British Honduras in Central America and British Guiana in South America. The area involved is some 110,000 square miles and the population about 2,300,000.

The possessions of France in American waters are less extensive than those of England, but are important. They begin on the north with St. Pierre and Miquelon and include Martinique, the Guadeloupe Islands, and French Guiana, the latter a mainland colony with some coastal islands. The total area is 33,000 square miles and the population 529,000.

The people of the United States have already proved their willingness to help England and France; it is time for those countries to demonstrate their willingness to recognize our past helpfulness and to relieve the United States of the presence of foreign naval bases in our home waters. We have no territorial ambitions in Europe.

The transfer of the territory in question at fair valuations would also serve to relieve the burden of payment which now rests on British and French taxpayers.

IMPEACHMENT OF ANDREW W. MELLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of constitutional privilege. On my own responsibility as a Member of this House, I impeach Andrew William Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors, and offer the following resolution:

Whereas the said Andrew William Mellon, of Pennsylvania, was nominated Secretary of the Treasury of the United States by the then Chief Executive of the Nation, Warren G. Harding, March 4, 1921; his nomination was confirmed by the Senate of the United States on March 4, 1921; he has held said office since March 4, 1921, without further nominations or confirmations.

Whereas section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides:

"Sec. 243. Restrictions upon Secretary of Treasury: No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or Treasurer, or register, shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel, or purchase by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State, or of the United States, or take or apply to his own use any emolument or gain for negotiating or transacting any business in the Treasury Department other than what shall be allowed by law; and every person who offends against any of the prohibitions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of \$3,000, and shall upon conviction be removed from office, and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States; and if any other person than a public prosecutor shall give information of any such offense, upon which a prosecution and conviction shall be had, one-half the aforesaid penalty of \$3,000 when recovered shall be for the use of the person giving such information."

Whereas the said Andrew William Mellon has not only been indirectly concerned in carrying on the business of trade and commerce in violation of the above-quoted section of the law but has been directly interested in carrying on the business of trade and commerce in that he is now and has been since taking the oath of office as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the owner of a substantial interest in the form of voting stock in more than 300 corporations with resources aggregating more than \$3,000,000,000, being some of the largest corporations on earth, and he and his family and close business associates in many instances own a majority of the stock of said corporations and, in some instances, constitute ownership of practically the entire outstanding capital stock; said corporations are engaged in the business of trade and commerce in every State, county, and village in the United States, every country in the world, and upon the Seven Seas; said corporations are extensively engaged in the following businesses: Mining properties, bauxite, magnesium, carbon electrodes, aluminum, sales, railroads, Pullman cars, gas, electric light, street railways, copper, glass, brass, steel, tar, banking, locomotives, water power, steamship, shipbuilding, oil, coke, coal, and many other different industries; said corporations are directly interested in the tariff, in the levying and collections of Federal taxes, and in the shipping of products upon the high seas; many of the products of these corporations are protected by our tariff laws and the Secretary of the Treasury has direct charge of the enforcement of these laws.

MELLON'S OWNERSHIP OF SEA VESSELS AND CONTROL OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Whereas the Coast Guard (sec. 1, ch. 1, title 14, of the United States Code) is a part of the military forces of the United States and is operated under the Treasury Department in time of peace;

that the Secretary of the Treasury directs the performance of the Coast Guard (sec. 51, ch. 1, title 14, of the Code of Laws of the United States); that officers of the Coast Guard are deemed officers of the customs (sec. 66, ch. 2, title 14, United States Code), and it is their duty to go on board the vessels which arrive within the United States, or within 4 leagues of the coast thereof, and search and examine the same, and every part thereof, and shall demand, receive, and certify the manifests required to be on board certain vessels, shall affix and put proper fastenings on the hatches and other communications with the hold of any vessel, and shall remain on board such vessels until they arrive at the port of their destination; that the said Andrew William Mellon is now, and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury, the owner in whole or in part of many sea vessels operating to and from the United States, and in competition with other steamship lines; that his interest in the sea vessels and his control over the Coast Guard represent a violation of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States superintends the collection of the duties on imports (sec. 3, ch. 1, title 19, Code of Laws of the United States); he establishes and promulgates rules and regulations for the appraisement of imported merchandise and the classification and assessment of duties thereon at various ports of entry (sec. 382, ch. 3, title 19, Code of Laws of United States); that the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, is now and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury, personally interested in the importation of goods, wares, articles, and merchandise in substantial quantities and large amounts; that it is repugnant to American principles and a violation of the laws of the United States for such an officer to hold the dual position of serving two masters—himself and the United States.

OWNERSHIP OF SEA VESSELS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon is now, and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, holding said office in violation of that part of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States, which provides that "no person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, * * * shall be the owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel," in that he was and is now the owner in whole or in part of the following sea vessels:

Registered in Norway: *Austvangen, Nordvangen, Sorvangen, Vestvangen.*

Venezuelan flag: 14 tankers, of 36,654 gross tons.
United States flag: *S. Hatti*; 13 general cargo vessels, *Conemaugh, Gulf of Mexico, Gulfbird, Gulfcoast, Gulfgem, Gulfling, Gulfight, Gulfoil, Gulfpoint, Gulfprince, Gulfstar, Gulfstream, Gulfwoax, Harmony, Ligonier, Ohio, Susquehanna, Winifred, Currier, Gulf of Venezuela, Gulfbreeze, Gulfcrest, Gulfhawk, Gulfland, Gulfmaid, Gulfpenn, Gulfpride, Gulfqueen, Gulfstate, Gulftrade, Gulfwing, Juniata, Monongahela, Supreme, Trinidadian.*

INCOME TAXES PAID BY MELLON COMPANIES AND REFUNDS MADE TO THEM—BY HIMSELF

Whereas section 1 (2), chapter 1, title 26, of the Code of Laws of the United States, provides "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall have general superintendence of the assessment and collection of all duties and taxes imposed by any law providing internal revenue * * *." The tax laws of the United States, including the granting of refunds, credits, and abatements, are administered in secret under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury; that income-tax returns and evidence upon which refunds are made, or granted, to taxpayers are not subject to public inspection; that under the direction of the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, many hundred corporations that are substantially owned by him annually make settlement for their taxes and many such corporations have been granted under his direction large tax refunds amounting to tens of millions of dollars.

OWNERSHIP OF BANK STOCK

Whereas section 244, chapter 3, title 12, of the Code of Laws of the United States, provides:

"Sec. 244. Chairman of the board; qualifications of members; vacancies.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be ex officio chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. No member of the Federal Reserve Board shall be an officer or director of any bank, banking institution, trust company, or Federal reserve bank, nor hold stock in any bank, banking institution, or trust company; * * *." That the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, is now and has been since becoming Secretary of the Treasury the owner of stock in a bank, banking institution, and trust company in violation of this law.

WHISKY BUSINESS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon has held the office of Secretary of the Treasury in violation of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States, in that from March 4, 1921, to October 2, 1928, he was interested in and received his share of the proceeds and profits from the sale of distilled whisky, which said whisky was sold as a commodity in trade and commerce.

ALUMINUM IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Whereas the said Andrew W. Mellon has further violated the law which prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from being

directly or indirectly interested or concerned in the carrying on of business or trade or commerce, in that as Secretary of the Treasury he controls the construction and maintenance of public buildings; the Office of the Supervising Architect is subject to the direction and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; the duties performed by the Supervising Architect embrace the following: Preparation of drawings, estimates, specifications, etc., for and the superintendence of the work of constructing, rebuilding, extending, or repairing public buildings; under the supervision of the Supervising Architect and subject to the direction and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury the Government of the United States has spent and will soon spend several hundred million dollars in the construction of public buildings. The said Andrew W. Mellon is the principal owner and controls the Aluminum Co. of America, which produces and markets practically all of the aluminum in the United States used for all purposes. The said Andrew W. Mellon has, while occupying the position as Secretary of the Treasury, directly interested himself in the carrying on and promotion of the business of the Aluminum Co. of America by causing to be published in Room 410 of the Treasury Building of the United States, located between the United States Capitol and the White House, a magazine known as the Federal Architect, published quarterly, which carries the pictures of public buildings in which aluminum is used in their construction and carries articles concerning the use of aluminum in architecture which suggest how aluminum can be used for different purposes in the construction of public buildings for the purpose of convincing the architects who draw the plans and specifications for public buildings that aluminum can and should be used for certain construction work and ornamental purposes. The use of aluminum in the construction of public buildings displaces materials which can be purchased on competitive bids, whereas the Aluminum Co. of America holds a monopoly and has no competitors. Said magazine is published by employees of the United States Government in the Office of the Supervising Architect and distributed to the architects of the Nation, many of whom have been or will be employed by the Supervising Architect to draw plans and specifications for public buildings in their local communities. More aluminum is now being used in the construction of public buildings, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, than has ever before been used, as a result of this advantage.

MELLON INTEREST IN SOVIET UNION (RUSSIA)

Whereas section 140 of title 19 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides:

"Sec. 140. Goods manufactured by convict labor prohibited.—All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision"—

charges are now being made that goods, wares, articles, and merchandise are being transported to the United States from the Soviet Union (Russia) in violation of this act; the present Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, whose duty it is to enforce this provision of the law, is one of the principal owners of the Koppers Co., a company with resources amounting to \$143,379,352, which is carrying on trade and commerce in all parts of the world; that said company during the year 1930 made a contract with the Soviet Union whereby the Koppers Co. obligated itself to build coke ovens and steel mills in the Soviet Union aggregating in value \$200,000,000, in furtherance of the Soviet's 5-year plan; that said contract is now being carried into effect, and the said Andrew W. Mellon is financially interested in its success; that his interest in this contract with the Soviet Union destroys his impartiality as an officer of the United States to enforce the above-quoted law; his interest in said company, which is engaged in the business of carrying on trade and commerce, disqualifies him as Secretary of the Treasury under section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States and makes him guilty of a high misdemeanor and subject to impeachment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the official conduct of Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, to determine whether, in its opinion, he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which, in the contemplation of the Constitution, requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Such committee shall report its findings to the House together with such resolution of impeachment or other recommendation as it deems proper.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures not exceeding \$5,000, as it deems necessary.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the articles just read be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and upon that motion I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the articles be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL SHIPS

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Naval Affairs Committee has before it a program that calls for an expenditure of more than \$616,000,000 to be used in the construction of additional ships. I have always taken the position that our Navy should be given all of the support that is necessary to protect our citizens, and when it is taken into consideration that with an adequate air force no nation on earth could land an army on our shores, I can not conscientiously support any such program when all of this money is to be expended for a class of ships that are not needed at the present time. I felt warranted in presenting the following statement to the Naval Affairs Committee:

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday Secretary Adams, testifying before this committee, made the statement that the President of the United States had not been consulted with respect to the proposed naval building program bill amounting to more than \$616,000,000. President Hoover is the Commander in Chief of all of our military forces. If he has not been consulted in regard to the military program, then, as I view it, it is the duty of all subordinates to acquaint him with any policy they desire to see put into effect. If Secretary Adams has not done this, then I can not see how he can appear before this committee and act in good faith to the President. If Secretary Adams is not in accord with the President's views on matters of vital interest to the Nation and the world, then, following the precedents established by William Jennings Bryan and others while serving in the Cabinet, he should tender his resignation.

Yesterday I offered a motion that the bill be sent to the Navy Department for a report, having in mind that this action, if taken, would cause the committee to have before it officially the views of the department, thus enabling the Secretary of the Navy to proceed in a proper way, thereby giving the views of the administration. The motion was defeated, as only Congressman EVANS, of California, and Congressman BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, voted with me for the motion.

Many of the best minds in the Nation are of the opinion that it would not be possible for any nation on earth to land an army on our shores as long as we maintain adequate aircraft. If this is true, then the expenditure of \$700,000,000 could not possibly be of any service to the Nation unless we were contemplating some kind of offensive military move. The country at the present time is facing its greatest depression. There are over 6,000,000 out of employment. There have been over 10,000 banks crashed within the last few years. The Government is facing a deficit that is estimated at \$2,000,000,000. Imports and exports have fallen off several million dollars. The staple products of the country, such as corn and wheat, are selling below the cost of production. The people of the United States, in my opinion, will not countenance the expenditure of such a sum of money for military purposes, unless the necessity is apparent, and I can not conscientiously support such a program.

The President of the United States has already appointed delegates to meet with the representatives of the other military powers for the purpose of reducing expenditures. The countries that have been benefited by the moratorium expended last year nearly \$2,000,000,000 for armaments. The wild struggle for military supremacy on the part of various nations is the principal cause for the depression in Europe, and unless new agreements can be put into effect and those charged with the responsibility of representing our people will assume a peaceful and friendly attitude, untold miseries and hardships will be the result. As I view it, the Naval Affairs Committee should give the delegates appointed by the President the right to proceed in a friendly manner without following the dictation of certain officials in the Navy who will gladly spend all of the money there is in this Nation for the purpose of constructing a few additional ships, many of which are now in the obsolescent type.

The Democratic majority leader, Congressman Henry T. RAINEY, has been quoted by the press as being against this program. Congressman Joseph W. BYRNS, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has offered a bill to consolidate all of the military activities under one head, having in mind that expenditures must be reduced. I desire to congratulate him for making this proposal, as such a policy would do away with duplication, extravagance, and waste to the extent millions of dollars could be saved and at the same time more efficiency could be brought about.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. SOMERS of New York, for an indefinite period, on account of the death of his father.

Mr. THOMASON, on account of illness.

Mr. THURSTON, on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. CHASE, on account of death in his family.

Mr. BOHN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, to meet to-morrow, Thursday, January 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

351. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Weymouth Fore River, Mass., from Hingham Bay to the Weymouth Fore River Bridge (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

352. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Kodiak Harbor, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

353. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Youngs Bay and Youngs River, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 209); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

354. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Stikine River, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

355. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of East Waterway, Seattle Harbor, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

356. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Fox River, Wis., with a view to the control of its floods (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

357. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report of that company for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1931; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LOOFBOUROW: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6663. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. LaForge; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4150. A bill authorizing issuance of patents in fee to Benjamin Spottedhorse and Horse Spottedhorse for certain lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Fry; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 565) granting a pension to Ada May Fuller; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 707) granting a pension to Ella I. Dewire; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1052) granting a pension to Hiram P. Marcum; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7108) to provide that no interest shall be charged veterans on loans made on adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 7109) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOLAND: A bill (H. R. 7110) imposing a tax on motor busses and motor trucks operating in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 7111) to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide safer access to national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7112) to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Western Judicial District of Oklahoma to be held at Shawnee, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 7113) authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the Battle of Arkansas Post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 7114) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7115) authorizing appropriations for the construction and maintenance of improvements necessary for protection of the national forests from fire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7116) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7117) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7118) to protect trademarks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 7119) to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 7120) to provide for the construction of post-office buildings to relieve unemployment and economic depression, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 7121) to repeal obsolete statutes and improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 7122) to provide for the confirmation of a selection of certain lands by the State of Arizona for the benefit of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 7123) to provide for the manufacture and sale of industrial and beverage alcohol for

lawful purposes in Osage County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 91) to provide for an investigation of general labor conditions throughout the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 92) relative to impeachment of Andrew William Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 181) authorizing an appropriation for the expenses of the sixteenth session of the International Geological Congress to be held in the United States in 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 182) authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of participation by the United States Government in the second polar year program, August 1, 1932–August 31, 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 7124) granting an increase of pension to Maria Stackhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7125) to provide for an examination and survey of the channel of Little Wicomico River, Northumberland County, Va., and of the channel connecting the said river with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7126) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the channel in Jacksons Creek, Middlesex County, Va., and the channel connecting with the channel in the Plankatank River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7127) to provide for an examination and survey of the waters and channels between the Chesapeake Bay and Chincoteague Bay in the State of Virginia, lying between the mainland and the islands along the coast with a view to providing an inland waterway from the Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOLTON: A bill (H. R. 7128) for the relief of Della O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 7129) granting a pension to Lillie J. Goens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7130) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Risk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 7131) for the relief of Theodore Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 7132) for the relief of Fred West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7133) granting a pension to Cora B. Noyes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 7134) for the relief of Julia Santiago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 7135) granting a pension to John Swindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7136) for the relief of Moses F. Birdwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 7137) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States court in the Indian Territory or the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for a survey in Old Tampa Bay, Fla., from the vicinity of Port Tampa, to Bay View, in the same bay, with a view to securing a channel of approximately 14 feet depth and 100 feet wide, together with the necessary turning basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7139) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Blair; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7140) for the relief of Royal W. Robertson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7141) granting an increase of pension to Ada A. Bevers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7142) for the relief of the heirs of C. K. Bowen, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 7143) granting a pension to Emma Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 7144) granting a pension to Anna Weatherby Gibbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7145) granting a pension to Walter M. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7146) granting a pension to Mayme Gienandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 7147) granting a pension to Robert F. Tool; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7148) granting an increase of pension to Mabel C. B. Frazier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7149) granting a pension to Dora E. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7150) for the relief of Adelaide A. Whiteman and her husband, William F. Whiteman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of Fred Floyd Ferguson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 7152) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7153) granting an increase of pension to Jane Righenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7154) for the relief of R. Q. Merrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7155) for the relief of George Henry Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 7156) granting a pension to Eleanora Emma Bliss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 7157) for the relief of Hyman E. Shulman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7158) granting an increase of pension to Miranda C. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7159) for the relief of Stanwaity Killcrease; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7160) for the relief of Spencer Talkington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7161) for the relief of Clarence P. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7162) granting a pension to Taylor Pinkston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7163) granting a pension to Larkin P. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7164) granting a pension to Margaret A. Moomaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7165) granting a pension to John B. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERSON: A bill (H. R. 7166) granting a pension to Ella M. Lawhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOTT: A bill (H. R. 7167) for the relief of Stuart L. Ritz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7168) for the relief of James R. Hess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7169) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Pickett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 7170) granting an increase of pension to John P. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7171) granting a pension to Margaret Thurman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Katherine M. De Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 7173) granting a pension to Joseph J. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7174) for the relief of James J. Meaney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7175) for the relief of Abe Rubenstein; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7176) granting a pension to Esther Simpson Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7177) granting a pension to Caroline Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7178) granting a pension to Nellie F. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7179) granting a pension to Annie Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to Kizy A. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 7181) for the relief of Homer V. Milton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

271. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the Association of General Chairmen, Standard Railroad Organizations, in New York City, opposing all forms of transportation competing with the railroads under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

272. Also, letter from the president of the Eppinger & Russell Co., of New York, N. Y., in re tax revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

273. Also, letter from Whitehead Bros. Co., New York, N. Y., opposing the proposed tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

274. Also, telegram from A. R. Gribben, president of the Auburn Sales Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y., opposing tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

275. Also, letter from the president of the Simons, Stewart Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y., opposing tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

276. By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of Emil Schwartz and John Petz and approximately 1,300 other residents of Detroit, for legislation curbing the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

277. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of California State Association of Journeymen Barbers, that Congress take whatever action seems necessary to create in these United States a state of temperance in the use of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

278. By Mr. DE PRIEST: Petition of Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers' Industrial Association of the United States and Canada, Local No. 93, New Orleans, La., affiliated with the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Petition of the Larimer County Stockgrowers Association, opposing any further extension to the Rocky Mountain National Park in particular

or any other national park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

280. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of California Farmers' Convention, Sacramento, Calif., December 2, 3, and 14, 1931, re National Farm Board; duty on importation on pineapples and bananas from all foreign countries; financing of foreign countries and competition of the Philippines and Cuba, causing wreckage of American farming; continuance of Federal Farm Board, adequate tariff the foundation of farm relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

281. Also, petition of George A. Marshall Camp, No. 89, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, to amend the act of Congress approved March 26, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

282. Also, petition of board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, Calif., to amend the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. Also, petition of Shasta County Pomona Grante, through its secretary, Mrs. Gertrude A. Steger, for forest-fire control and preservation of the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

284. Also, petition of Los Angeles section, American Society of Civil Engineers, for sufficient appropriations for mapping purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

285. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary 37 to Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers, opposing the passage of H. R. 4711 and 5467 reducing the salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

286. By Mr. HERR: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Tacoma, urging the construction of naval vessels under the London agreement of 1930 to the maximum set by that treaty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

287. By Mr. KURTZ: Resolution from Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing resubmission of national prohibition to the States by a resolution to submit an appeal amendment either to State conventions or to State legislatures for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. By Mr. PERSON: Resolution of city commission of the city of Royal Oak, Mich., favoring legislation which provides for the creation of a sinking fund to refinance legally constituted drainage districts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

289. Also, petition of citizens of Detroit, Mich., and vicinity, to enact legislation to curb the activities of the chain-store system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

290. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolutions of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, San Antonio Chapter, No. 14, relative to veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

291. Also, resolution of Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Heart of Texas Chapter, No. 19, Temple, Tex., relative to veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

292. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Joseph Gagnon and many other citizens of Eagle Lake, Aroostook County, Me., urging that duty be placed on forest products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who abidest with us in the darkness even as in the light, leading us the while, hold captive every waiting thought as we contemplate anew the mystery of Thy indwelling; By our awareness of Thy presence quicken the sense of obligation involved in our relationship to Thee, our country, and our fellow men, that from the dark-woven flow of change the mask of transience may be lifted, revealing to the light our own immortal destiny. Bring Honour back to earth as king once more, cause Nobleness to walk our